



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

157

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,983	09/19/2003	Robert W. Moushon	GMO 004	5375

25866 7590 02/11/2005  
STEVEN J. ADAMSON, PC  
P.O. BOX 5997  
PORTLAND, OR 97228

EXAMINER

WATSON, ROBERT C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/665,983	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOUSHON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Robert C. Watson	<b>Art Unit</b> 3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wagoner.

Wagoner shows a socket driving device having a driving shaft 17, a striking surface 19, and a first coupling protrusion 24.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4-5, 11-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagoner in view of Upthegrove.

Upthegrove teaches the use of an impacting device consisting of various differently sized adapters having a protrusion on one end and socket at the other end.

To provide Wagoner with an adaptor(s) with a protrusion on one end and a socket at the other end would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Upthegrove. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to adapt the driving device to different sized socket members. Furthermore, the examiner takes official notice that in a standard socket wrench set there are adaptors for adapting the wrench to different sized

sockets. Hence, it would be obvious to adapt the driving device to different sized socket members. The relative size of the sockets and protrusions are no more than an obvious matter of design choice absent a showing of criticality for this feature. Size considerations are ordinarily of no patentable significance.

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagoner in view of Upthegrove as above applied and further in view of Tate.

Tate shows a driving device with various extenders wherein the extenders have a protrusion at one end and a socket at the other end.

To provide an extender(s) for the Wagoner tool would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Tate. Furthermore, the examiner takes official notice that in a standard socket wrench set there are extenders for extending the wrench. Hence, it would be obvious to extend the driving device to the socket members. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to make use of the driving device more convenient for the user.

Claim 8 and 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagoner in view of Main.

Main teaches that a protrusion may have a biasing member.

To provide a biasing member on the protrusion of Wagoner would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Main. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this

Art Unit: 3723

in order to provide a more positive engagement between the protrusion and the socket  
in order to prevent inadvertent disassembly of the mating socket members.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Watson whose telephone number is 703 308-1747. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs. , 5:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail III can be reached on 703 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rcw

  
ROBERT C. WATSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER